

Remarks

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 3-9, 12-18, 22-23, and 26-34 are pending in the application. Claims 3, 4, 7-9, 18, 22, 26-28 have been amended. Claims 1-2, 10-11, 19-21, and 24-25 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 32-35 have been newly added. Claims 12-17, and 29-31 are withdrawn. Applicant believes that this Amendment does not add new matter. In view of the foregoing Amendment and following Remarks, allowance of the pending claims is requested.

Examiner Interview

Applicant thanks Examiner Ranodhi N. Serrao for granting Applicant's representatives the courtesies of an Examiner Interview conducted on February 7, 2008. Applicant's representatives provided clarifications regarding the features of the claimed invention and explained how these differ from the Ramanathan (U.S. Patent No. 6,286,047) and Bishop (U.S. Patent No. 6,983,317) references relied upon by the Examiner.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 4, 9, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,983,317 to Bishop et al. (hereafter, Bishop) and U.S. Patent No. 6,286,047 to Ramanathan et al. (hereafter, Ramanathan). Applicant traverses this rejection because Bishop and Ramanathan, either alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claims 4, 9, and 18.

Referring to claim 4, Bishop and Ramanathan, alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest at least the features of:

generating, at the first managed networked resource, a table that includes the extracted dependency data, wherein the table is stored separate from other configuration data associated with the first managed networked resource that has been collected

by the software agent; and

offering access to the extracted dependency data in the table generated at the first managed networked resource, the access being offered via a dependency interface of the software agent executing on the first managed networked resource, the dependency interface being an interface for distributed systems management protocol.

The Examiner, at page 7 of the Office Action, admits that Ramanathan fails to teach or suggest these features; but, relies on Bishop for these features. Bishop, at column 38, lines 31-37 apparently describes an object table. However, Bishop fails to disclose that the object table includes extracted dependency data. Moreover, Bishop fails to disclose that the object table is generated at a first managed networked resource.

Bishop, at column 13, lines 12-22 apparently describes a *management console providing an interface* for the *management system*, wherein the management console interface provides access to management servers and functions. The Examiner appears to erroneously equate Bishop's interface provided by the *management console* to Applicant's "dependency interface" of the *software agent*. Bishop's interface provided by the management console provides *access to management servers and functions* that are *associated with the management system*.

However, Bishop fails to disclose that Bishop's interface is a dependency interface *of a software agent executing on a first managed networked resource*. In fact, Bishop discloses that "management console provides the primary interface with user for the management system". One of ordinary skill in the art would not equate a user with a software agent that executes on a first managed networked resource. Moreover, Bishop fails to disclose that Bishop's interface offers *access to extracted dependency data* in a table that is generated *at the first managed networked resource*. In contrast, Bishop discloses the interface providing access to *management servers and functions* that are associated with

the *management system*.

Thus, Bishop fails to address the deficiencies of Ramanathan. Hence, claim 4 is patentable over the references relied upon by the Examiner.

Referring to claim 9, Bishop and Ramanathan, alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest at least the features of:

processing, by the software manager, the gathered dependency data obtained from the first software agent to determine whether a provider or a consumer dependency relationship exists between the first managed network device and a second network device; and

initiating, by the software manager, a second software agent if a provider or a consumer dependency relationship exists between the first managed network device and a second network device, wherein the second software agent executes on and monitors the second network device.

The Examiner, at page 10 of the Office Action, admits that Ramanathan fails to teach or suggest these features; but, relies on Bishop for these features. Bishop, at Column 12, line 64- column 13, line 11 apparently describes an *operator* creating scripts for management elements that can be hooked up to management element icons, wherein these scripts would start and stop *services*. Moreover, Bishop apparently describes that when an *operator* executes a “start command” on the management element icon, the children icons will also get their start commands.

The Examiner appears to erroneously equate Bishop’s “operator” to Applicant’s “software manager”. However, one of ordinary skill in the art will not equate a human operator (as disclosed in Bishop) to Applicant’s software manager. Thus, Bishop fails to disclose a *software manager initiating* a second *software agent* that *executes on* and *monitors a second network device*. Moreover, Bishop fails to disclose that the *software manager processes gathered*

dependency data to determine whether a provider or a consumer dependency relationship exists between the first managed network device and a second network device, much less, the software manager initiating the second software agent if such a provider or consumer dependency relationship does exist.

Thus, Bishop fails to address the deficiencies of Ramanathan. Hence, claim 9 is patentable over the references relied upon by the Examiner.

Claim 18 has been amended to include the features:

processing, by the software manager, the extracted dependency data obtained from the plurality of software agents to determine whether a provider or a consumer dependency relationship exists between at least one of the plurality of managed networked resources and one or more additional networked resources not included in the plurality of managed networked resources; and

initiating, by the software manager, management of the one or more additional networked resources not included in the plurality of managed networked resources if a provider or a consumer dependency relationship exists between at least one of the plurality of managed networked resources and the one or more additional networked resources.

As mentioned above, Bishop and Ramanathan, either alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest that the *software manager processes the extracted dependency data* to determine whether a provider or a consumer *dependency relationship exists between* at least one of the plurality of *managed* networked resources and one or more *additional* networked resources *not included in the plurality of managed networked resources*.

Furthermore, Kekic fails to cure the deficiencies of Bishop and Ramanathan. Kekic, at column 5, lines 8-14 appears to describe a managed

element server that executes on a first computer and at least one managed element server client executing on a second computer. However, there is no mention of the software manager initiating the management of one or more additional networked resources not included in the plurality of managed networked resources if a provider or a consumer dependency relationship exists between at least one of the plurality of managed networked resources and the one or more additional networked resources. Hence, claim 18 is patentable over the references relied upon by the Examiner.

As such, Bishop, Ramanathan, and Kekic fail to disclose, teach or suggest, at least the above-mentioned features of the claims 4, 9 and 18. Thus, these claims are patentable.

Claims 27 and 28 include features similar to those set forth in claims 4 and 9. Claims 3, 5-8, 22-23, 26, and 32-35 depend from and add features to one of the claims 4, 9, 18, or 27. Thus, these claims are also patentable and the rejections of these claims must be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Date: **February 26, 2008**

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Nidhi Chetani

Registration No. 59,924

Customer No. 00909
LLP

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN

P.O. Box 10500

McLean, Virginia 22102

Main: 703-770-7900

Direct Dial: 703-770-7529

Fax: 703-770-7901